



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/800,771

03/16/2004

Won-Chul Bang

Q78833

2650

23373 7590 06/15/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

PARK, EDWARD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/15/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,771	Applicant(s) BANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Edward Park	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/23/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. **Claim 12** is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 6.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1, 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al (US 5,902,968).

Regarding **claim 1**, Sato teaches a handwriting trajectory recognition system, comprising:

Art Unit: 2624

a motion detection unit adapted to output electric signals based on changes in acceleration of a body of the system in space (Sato: figure 10, numerals 102a-c, figure 11, numerals 102a-c); and a control unit adapted to detect non-stroke regions intervals where the motions of the system body are temporarily stopped and recover handwritings based on the electric signals (Sato: col. 17, lines 12-22).

Regarding **claim 7**, Sato teaches a handwriting trajectory recognition method comprising: detecting changes in acceleration of a body of the system in space (Sato: figure 10, numerals 102a-c, figure 11, numerals 102a-c); deciding non-stroke regions if there exist intervals where motions of the system body are temporarily stopped (Sato: col. 17, lines 12-22); and recovering handwritings by the system body based on decision results (Sato: col. 29, numeral 243).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al (US 5,902,968) in view of Kashi et al (US 5,828,772).

Regarding **claim 2**, Sato discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 1. Sato further teaches determining a range of time where a stroke is present by comparing the

Art Unit: 2624

acceleration against a threshold (Sato: col. 35, lines 7-36). Sato does not teach calculating the standard deviation.

Kashi teaches calculating the standard deviation (Kashi: col. 3, lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sato reference to utilize the standard deviation as suggested by Kashi, to allow “larger total error [to] be tolerated if the [acceleration values] exhibit a high degree of scatter, than if they show a low degree of scatter” (Kashi: col. 3, lines 12-20).

Regarding **claim 3**, Sato discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 1. Sato further teaches determining a start of a stroke by comparing a fixed number of samples of acceleration starting prior to the start up to a fixed time subsequent to the start against a threshold (Sato: col. 7, lines 28-51). Sato does not teach calculating the standard deviation.

Kashi teaches calculating the standard deviation (Kashi: col. 3, lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sato reference to utilize the standard deviation as suggested by Kashi, to allow “larger total error [to] be tolerated if the [acceleration values] exhibit a high degree of scatter, than if they show a low degree of scatter” (Kashi: col. 3, lines 12-20).

Regarding **claim 4**, Sato discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 1. Sato further teaches determining an end of the stroke by comparing a fixed number of samples up to the end of the stroke against the threshold (Sato: col. 7, lines 28-51). Sato does not teach calculating the standard deviation.

Kashi teaches calculating the standard deviation (Kashi: col. 3, lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sato reference to utilize the standard deviation as suggested by Kashi, to allow “larger total error [to] be tolerated if the [acceleration values] exhibit a high degree of scatter, than if they show a low degree of scatter” (Kashi: col. 3, lines 12-20).

Regarding **claim 8**, Sato discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 7. Sato further teaches a range of time where a stroke is present is detected by comparing the acceleration against a threshold (Sato: col. 35, lines 7-36). Sato does not teach calculating the standard deviation.

Kashi teaches calculating the standard deviation (Kashi: col. 3, lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sato reference to utilize the standard deviation as suggested by Kashi, to allow “larger total error [to] be tolerated if the [acceleration values] exhibit a high degree of scatter, than if they show a low degree of scatter” (Kashi: col. 3, lines 12-20).

Regarding **claim 9**, Sato discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 7. Sato further teaches a start of a stroke is determined by comparing a fixed number of samples of acceleration starting prior to the start up to a fixed time subsequent to the start against a threshold (Sato: col. 7, lines 28-51). Sato does not teach calculating the standard deviation.

Kashi teaches calculating the standard deviation (Kashi: col. 3, lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sato reference to utilize the standard deviation as suggested by Kashi, to allow “larger total error [to] be tolerated if the [acceleration values] exhibit a high degree of scatter, than if they show a low degree of scatter” (Kashi: col. 3, lines 12-20).

Regarding **claim 10**, Sato discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 7. Sato further teaches determining by comparing a fixed number of samples up to the end of the stroke against the threshold (Sato: col. 7, lines 28-51). Sato does not teach calculating the standard deviation.

Kashi teaches calculating the standard deviation (Kashi: col. 3, lines 8-20).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sato reference to utilize the standard deviation as suggested by Kashi, to allow “larger total error [to] be tolerated if the [acceleration values] exhibit a high degree of scatter, than if they show a low degree of scatter” (Kashi: col. 3, lines 12-20).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. **Claims 5, 6, 11, and 12** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding **claim 5**, none of the references of record alone or in combination suggest or fairly teach the control unit determining an instant time k_1 to be a start of a stroke if $\sigma^s(k) < \sigma_h$ for a time interval $[k, k+H]$.

Regarding **claim 6**, none of the references of record alone or in combination suggest or fairly teach the control unit determining $(k-S)$ to be an end of the stroke if $\sigma^s(k) > \sigma_h$ for the time interval $[k, k+H]$ within a time $k \geq k_1 + W$.

Regarding **claim 11**, none of the references of record alone or in combination suggest or fairly teach an instant time k_1 to be determined to be a start of a stroke if $\sigma^s(k) < \sigma_{th}$ for a time interval $[k, k+H]$.

Regarding **claim 12**, none of the references of record alone or in combination suggest or fairly teach an instant time k_1 to be determined to be a start of a stroke if $\sigma^s(k) < \sigma_{th}$ for a time interval $[k, k+H]$.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Park whose telephone number is (571) 270-1576. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30 - 20:00, (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Werner can be reached on (571) 272-7401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2624

Edward Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

EP
5/31/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'B' followed by 'P. Werner'. The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Brian P. Werner
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2624